

VII.

Number V.

M O N A R C H Y,

OR

M O B - A R C H Y.

UTRUMQUE HORUM MAVIS, ACCIPE.

L O N D O N :

PRINTED FOR J. DEBRETT, OPPOSITE BURLINGTON-
HOUSE, PICCADILLY.

M.DCC.LC..



MONARCHY,

OR

MOB-ARCHY.

“ IT was not against Lewis XVI. but
“ against the despotic principles of the Go-
“ vernment that the nation revolted. These
“ principles had not their origin in him, but
“ in the original establishment, many centu-
“ ries back; and they were become too
“ deeply rooted to be removed, and the
“ Augean stable of parasites and plunderers
“ too abominably filthy to be cleansed by any
“ thing short of a *complete and universal revo-*
“ *lution.* When it becomes necessary to do a
A 2 “ thing,

“ thing, the whole heart and soul should go
 “ into the measure, or not attempt it. That
 “ crisis was then arrived, and there remained
 “ no choice at all but to act with determined
 “ vigour, or not to act at all. *The King was*
 “ *known to be the friend of the Nation, and*
 “ *this circumstance was favourable to the*
 “ enterprise. Perhaps no man, bred up in
 “ the stile of an absolute king, ever possessed
 “ a heart so little disposed to the exercise of
 “ that species of power as the present King
 “ of France.”

Rights of Man, by Thomas Paine, &c. &c.

I HAVE never yet heard of more than two
 arguments to justify the overturning the
 French Monarchy and razing it to its founda-
 tion, in order to establish, in its stead, a
 Republic upon democratical principles. The
 one is the justification of self-defence, by as-
 serting, that *the Friend of the Nation*, with
 Neckar still at the head of his Government,
 was plotting the demolishing the National As-
 sembly ;

sembly ; that those very purposes might, by violence, be frustrated, for which the King himself had just called them together, viz. the *regeneration* of the Constitution. The other, that there was no alternative left between the adopting the measures that have been pursued with the risk of all their consequences, and the confirmation of the old Government with all its abuses.—The first argument refutes itself by its absurdity ; the second, by the slightest view of the actual circumstances and position of the country.

The pressing evil that brought forward a crisis, which, in some mode or other, could not have been long delayed from the temper of the times, equally alienated from civil and religious superstition, was the insufficiency of the public revenue to answer the claims upon it ; and this difficulty had thrown the Monarch, though he had been as reluctant, as he was in fact well disposed to remedy abuses, entirely into the hands of his people. His

Government could no longer proceed without their assistance, and they were in a situation to stipulate the conditions of granting that assistance. But the King, by a singular good fortune, was himself ambitious of the true glory of reigning over a free people. His Minister was as little a Richlieu or a Mazarin, in his principles, as he was in his capacity ; such abilities as he had were, certainly, not thrown into the scale of despotism. The three orders of the States General had but one mind as to the regulations which they recommended to their Deputies, in support of what they called their ancient rights, and in confirmation of what they claimed as their ancient Constitution. They demanded, unanimously, the *sole* power of levying taxes in what proportions, and for what term, they should think fit, in the States General assembled ; declaring, at the same time, all other levies upon the subject unconstitutional and illegal. They demanded security to their persons from *arbitrary imprisonment*, by a law in the
nature

nature of our Habeas Corpus : that all *State Prisons* should be abolished, which they explain to mean, not the pulling down the brick and stone of particular places of confinement, but the suffering nobody to be committed to imprisonment, for state offences, to *any prison*, but by their own proper judges : That the consent of each of the three orders shall be necessary for giving sanction to the law of the land, whilst the executive power, with certain legislative powers, thought expedient to be exercised by the Crown in the interim of the meeting of the Etats, and subject to their revival, were of right to belong to the King. These, with many other outlines of a free government, (which as they kept the purse in their own power might have received, from time to time, whatever modifications should suggest themselves to render the system of liberty complete and perfect) were the unanimous demand of the whole nation intrusted to their Deputies, in written instructions of each of the three orders, which,

under oath, those Deputies engaged to carry into execution to the utmost of their power. The disposition, then, of no class or order in the nation, rendered it necessary to institute a new Republican government, from the impossibility of giving to the Monarchy such limitations, as would secure to every individual in the community the benefit of being *equally governed by law, and defended by law*, in the peaceable enjoyment of his life, liberty, and possessions; the only sense, in which I conceive, that men can be said to be equal, and the only definition I can devise of a free Government, in contra-distinction to *arbitrary power*. As little was the dissolution of the Monarchy necessary, from the refusal of the Monarch to acquiesce in these requisitions of his people, or from any opposition, on his part, to the carrying them into effect with his Royal sanction. What was the case? Had the Deputies, when they assembled, proceeded immediately to the discharge of the solemn trust reposed in them in their several Cham-

Chambers, France had been in less than a fortnight after their meeting, a free government without convulsion, without ill humour, without shocking the interest of a single individual. But this would not have answered the purposes of modern patriotism, though it might the purposes of the public. The pride, the passions, and the interests of ambitious men, and of visionary fanatics, lost sight of the instructions that had been committed to them. Instead of establishing the limited monarchy recommended to their care, a thousand wild schemes of republican innovation presented themselves to their imaginations : the Commons threw down the gauntlet to the other two orders, and all their time was lost in disputing, caballing, attacking, and defending, till they, at length, determined to cut the knot they could not untie by *resolving themselves to be* King, Lords, and Commons, and People, altogether.

It

It was the King, the father of this people, who came down in all the pomp of royalty, and (for the last time) accompanied by the branches of his illustrious house, to remonstrate against the shameful scandal of their dissensions; to call upon them, in the name of his people, to discharge the important duties of their trust. He laid before them, of his own free offer, a plan of constitutional reform, which embraced, nearly, every principal object in the instructions of the deputies; and concluded by warning them, that if the obstinacy of their disputes continued to intercept the happiness and freedom of his people, he should feel himself in conscience bound to enact those laws by his own authority, rather than suffer the expectations of the nation to be frustrated, and deprived of the blessings of a free government. What return was made to so generous a conduct? Will posterity believe that the gracious interference of the sovereign to make his people *free* has been cited in justifying the necessity of rendering him
the

the only imprisoned *slave* in his dominions. Scarcely did the procession begin to move from the Portal of the assembly, when murmur and dissatisfaction rose among the members, and angry votes to betray a spirit of resistance; whilst, without doors, seditious and contemptuous expressions were circulated to the very gates of the Palace. Where then was their affection towards the person of their sovereign, whose only crime was his solicitude to divest himself and his successors of arbitrary authority? Where their reverence for the ancient monarchy of France, so anxiously recommended to their care by their constituents, when even freedom, under the shape of monarchy, was rejected by them with disdain and indignation?

Deprived then of every argument to justify the necessity of forming a democracy, let us for a moment examine the *expediency* of it. I will not affront Mr. Paine and his party by quoting upon them, any authorities, ancient
or

or modern, upon these subjects from the days of Aristotle, down to the exploded Montesquieu. I well know how cheap such opinions must be held in the estimation of the discoverers of the *new lights*. I will not refer to the experience of the past from the earliest periods of history to the present times; because I am aware I can draw no satisfactory conclusions from events which have taken place in those ages of darkness, before the dawn of reason arose in our political hemisphere, which now displays its dazzling brightness; neither will I presume to dwell upon the obvious discouragements of *wantonly* sporting with the dearest interests of mankind, in experiments, which tend, in the first instance, to produce calamities of every species; outrages, confiscations, banishments, assassination, massacres, bankruptcy, and civil wars. I am well convinced that trifles of this sort ought not to weigh a feather in the scale, when theory and speculative perfection is opposed to it. No matter to what degree the well-being

well-being of *the individual*, man, is sacrificed, if man, *in the abstract*, is possessed of his indefeasible rights; he may starve, or be plundered, or be murdered, by the public, or by his fellow citizens; he will, and ought to bear all with patience, so as he has the satisfaction to know, that the dignity of his nature is asserted, that he is equally represented; and that he has given his consent to those laws, by which he feels himself oppressed, and which at the same time refuse him their protection. It is of little consequence (as every one knows) what are the laws of a country, so we take care only how they are made; and when once the *rights* of *man* are ascertained, no matter what benefit he receives from them.

Allow me, however, to doubt whether mankind might not be *happier*, at least, though perhaps less dignified, if that order was inverted. Whether the best *right* he has, and the only equality he can vindicate with truth, is not, the being governed equally by law,
and

and having equal protection from it, whatever be his condition, from the peasant even *down* to the prince inclusive.

Whether this protection will not be proportioned to the strength of the government, and that strength proportioned to the *stability* of it? Whether the perfection of a constitution is not when it imposes checks upon the *deliberative*, and affords as little check as possible to the vigour, secrecy, and decision of the *executive* power? Whether it is possible to make a nation of philosophers; whether he is a philosopher who thinks it is possible; and what would become of such a nation, if it were possible to remove from them the influence of prejudice and opinion? Whether institutions which have prevailed from the first traces of civil policy amongst mankind, do not seem to imply something analogous to our nature, and not very repugnant to our reason? Whether *classes* in society and inequality of conditions, by which we are linked together in a gradation of mutual dependence upon each other in society, is not, when well considered

sidered, the chief blessing we enjoy in it : and whether a state of equal perfect independence, if we could suppose it to exist, would not place us in a situation as miserable as it would be unnatural to us ?

“ Untwisting all the cords that tie

“ The hidden soul of harmony.”

Had the revolutionists so reflected, France might long since have been established in freedom as in prosperity ; and have appeared at this hour as much the object of envy, as she now is, and will long remain, the object of pity, and of warning to her neighbours. They would not have thought hereditary monarchy and hereditary nobility the support of it, such monstrous absurdities ! they would have seen in the crown something more than a bauble, shewn at the Tower for sixpence ; in the laurel wreath, or in the mitre, in the ribbon and the garter, something more than the playthings of children, or than what children see in them. A very superficial reasoner may, perhaps

perhaps, look down upon distinctions and honours, and rise high enough above the vulgar to *despise* prejudices; but a strong, sound understanding sees far enough to *respect* them.

- “ Take but degree away, untune that string,
 “ And hark, what discord follows; each thing meets
 “ In mere oppugnancy.
 “ *Force* should be *right*; or, rather right and wrong,
 “ Between whose endless jar Justice resides,
 “ Should lose their name, and so should Justice too.
 “ Then every thing include itself in *power*,
 “ Power into *will*—Will into *appetite*;
 “ And appetite a universal wolf,
 “ So doubly seconded by will and power,
 “ Must make per force an universal prey,
 “ And last eat up itself.”

TROILUS and CRESSIDA.

